

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11, 27 and 30-31 have been amended. New claims 32-36 have been added. Claims 1, 11, 27 and 30-36 are pending.

Applicants have timely filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with this Amendment, including the filing fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of any Office action and enter this Amendment for consideration under 37 CFR 1.114.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 11, 27 and 30-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 11, 27 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Holmquest (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,105) in view of Hoyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,105).

Holmquest and Hoyle et al., alone or in combination, discuss or suggest:

allowing magnetic flux change occurring to a circuit wiring to act on a detecting conductor arranged in the vicinity of the circuit wiring, the magnetic flux change occurring because of a change in a circuit current due to discharge, both the detecting conductor and the circuit wiring being printed on a same side of a circuit board, the detecting conductor having a straight-line segment disposed parallel to a straight-line segment of the circuit wiring such that the magnetic flux change that occurs to the circuit wiring is allowed to act on the straight-line segment of the detecting conductor,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides that both the detecting conductor and the circuit wiring are print-formed on a same side of a circuit board. The Examiner concedes that Holmquest does not teach this feature of claim 1 and attempts to make up for this deficiency with Hoyle et al. However, it respectfully submitted that Hoyle et al. fails to make up for this deficiency. Hoyle et al. does not teach both a detecting conductor and circuit wiring that are print-formed on a same side of a circuit board.

Since Holmquest and Hoyle et al., alone or in combination, discuss or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and there is no proper motivation to combine the references, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Holmquest and Hoyle et al., alone or in combination discuss or suggest:

allowing magnetic flux change occurring to a circuit wiring to act on a detecting conductor arranged in the vicinity of the circuit wiring, the magnetic flux change occurring because of a change in a circuit current due to discharge, both the detecting conductor and the circuit wiring being printed on a same side of a circuit board, the detecting conductor having a straight-line segment disposed parallel to a straight-line segment of the circuit wiring such that the magnetic flux change that occurs to the circuit wiring is allowed to act on the straight-line segment of the detecting conductor,

as recited in amended claim 11, and there is no proper motivation to combine the references.

Therefore, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Holmquest and Hoyle et al., alone or in combination discuss or suggest:

allowing magnetic flux change occurring to a circuit wiring to act on a detecting conductor arranged in the vicinity of the circuit wiring, the magnetic flux change occurring because of a change in a circuit current due to discharge, both the detecting conductor and the circuit wiring being printed on a same side of a circuit board, the detecting conductor having a straight-line segment disposed parallel to a straight-line segment of the circuit wiring such that the magnetic flux change that occurs to the circuit wiring is allowed to act on the straight-line segment of the detecting conductor,

as recited in amended claim 27, and there is no proper motivation to combine the references.

Therefore, claim 27 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Holmquest and Hoyle et al., alone or in combination discuss or suggest:

allowing a magnetic flux change produced by a circuit to act on a detecting conductor located in a vicinity of the circuit, with the magnetic flux change occurring due to a change in a circuit current due to a discharge, both the detecting conductor and the circuit wiring being printed on a same side of a circuit board, the detecting conductor having a straight-line segment disposed parallel to a straight-line segment of the circuit wiring such that the magnetic flux change that occurs to the circuit wiring is allowed to act on the straight-line segment of the detecting conductor,

as recited in amended claim 30, and there is no proper motivation to combine the references.

Therefore, claim 30 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Holmquest and Hoyle et al., alone or in combination discuss or suggest:

allowing a magnetic flux change produced by a circuit current flowing through a circuit wiring to act on a detecting conductor

located in a vicinity of the circuit wiring, both the detecting conductor and the circuit wiring being printed on a same side of a circuit board, the detecting conductor having a straight-line segment disposed parallel to a straight-line segment of the circuit wiring such that the magnetic flux change that occurs to the circuit wiring is allowed to act on the straight-line segment of the detecting conductor,

as recited in amended claim 31, and there is no proper motivation to combine the references. Therefore, claim 31 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 32-36 depend from independent claims 1, 11, 27, and 30-31, respectively. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 32-36 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

4-27-09

By:



Aaron C. Walker

Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501